UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/770,098	02/02/2004	Daniel J. Miller	MS1-0631USC2	9124

22801 7590 07/06/2009

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE
SUITE 1400
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER	
PATEL, HARESH N	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2454	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
07/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/770,098	MILLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HARESH N. PATEL	2454	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 April 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3 and 5-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-14,16-18 and 20* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *15 and 19* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/3/09, 12/24/08*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-3, 5-20 are subject to examination. Claim 4 is cancelled.

2. Claims 15 and 19 are allowable but objected to.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejected claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Parry et al. 6,535,920 (Hereinafter Parry-Microsoft).

6. Referring to claim 1, Parry-Microsoft discloses a media processing system comprising: a source (e.g., col., 6); a software object, coupling the source to one or more of a plurality of processing chains, to satisfy multiple (e.g., col., 6), non-combinable requests to the source for media content (e.g., col., 6), wherein non-combinable requests for media include one or more of requests where a source time of the requested content

do not align, requests where project time of the requests do not align (e.g., col., 6), and requests where the requested content is to be processed differently so as to require a separate processing chain (e.g., col., 6); one or more processing units; and a system memory configured to store the software object (e.g., col., 6).

7. Referring to claim 2, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses wherein the software object is a segment filter (e.g., col., 7).

8. Referring to claim 3, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses wherein the software object is exposed to an operating system executing on a computing system implementing the media processing system (e.g., col., 7).

9. Referring to claim 5, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses wherein the software object is implemented within a filter graph representation of a user-defined media processing project, to reduce invoked instances of the media source required to satisfy said non-combinable requests (e.g., col., 7).

10. Referring to claim 6, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses the software object receives independent requests for content from one or more media processing chains (e.g., col., 7).

11. Referring to claim 7, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses wherein the software object generates and issues one or more seek command(s) to satisfy said requests (e.g., col., 7).

12. Referring to claim 8, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses wherein the media processing system selectively invokes multiple instances of the software object to satisfy multiple simultaneous requests for content, wherein each instance of the software object requires an associated instance of the media source anti a processing chain (e.g., col., 7).

13. Referring to claim 9, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses wherein the software object serializes multiple simultaneous requests for media content received from multiple processing chains (e.g., col., 7).

14. Referring to claim 10, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses wherein the software object is a segment filter in a filter graph of filters dynamically generated to process media in accordance with a user-defined processing project (e.g., col., 7).

15. Referring to claim 11, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses a media processing system comprising: a

source (e.g., col., 6); a software object, coupling the source to one or more of a plurality of processing chains (e.g., col., 6), to satisfy multiple, non-combinable requests to the source for media content (e.g., col., 6), wherein the software object is a segment filter in a filter graph of filters dynamically generated to process media in accordance with a user-defined processing project (e.g., col., 6); a scalable, dynamically reconfigurable matrix switch having a plurality of inputs and a plurality of outputs (e.g., col., 6); at least one matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a first processing chain portion (e.g., col., 6); at least one other matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a second processing chain portion (e.g., col., 6); the matrix switch being configured to dynamically couple one or more of the matrix switch inputs to one or more of the matrix switch outputs; one or more processing units (e.g., col., 6); and a system memory configured to store the software object (e.g., col., 6).

16. Referring to claim 12, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix switch outputs based, at least in part, on a media time associated with a user defined media processing project (e.g., col., 7).

17. Referring to claim 13, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix

switch outputs based, at least in part, on a project time associated with a user defined media processing project (e.g., col., 7).

18. Referring to claim 14, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix switch outputs based, at least in part, on content of a matrix switch programming grid (e.g., col., 7).

19. Referring to claim 16, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses a media processing system comprising: a source (e.g., col., 6); a software object, coupling the source to one or more of a plurality of processing chains (e.g., col., 6), to satisfy multiple, non-combinable requests to the source for media content (e.g., col., 6), wherein non-combinable requests for media include one or more of requests where a source time of the requested content do not align, requests where project time of the requests do not align (e.g., col., 6), and requests where the requested content is to be processed differently, so as to require a separate processing chain (e.g., col., 6); wherein the software object is a segment filter in a filter graph of filters dynamically generated to process media in accordance with a user-defined processing project one or more processing units (e.g., col., 6); and a system memory configured to store the software object (e.g., col., 6).

20. Referring to claim 17, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses a scalable, dynamically reconfigurable matrix switch having a plurality of inputs and a plurality of outputs; at least one matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a first processing chain portion (e.g., col., 7); at least one other matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a second processing chain portion (e.g., col., 7); and the matrix switch being configured to dynamically couple one or more of the matrix switch inputs to one or more of the matrix switch outputs (e.g., col., 7).

21. Referring to claim 18, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix switch outputs based, at least in part, on a media time associated with the user defined media processing project (e.g., col., 7).

22. Referring to claim 20, Parry-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Parry-Microsoft also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix switch outputs based, at least in part, on content of a matrix switch programming grid (e.g., col., 7).

23. Claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lortz, 7047554 (Hereinafter Lortz).

24. Referring to claim 1, Lortz discloses a media processing system comprising: a source (e.g., col., 3); a software object, coupling the source to one or more of a plurality of processing chains, to satisfy multiple (e.g., col., 3), non-combinable requests to the source for media content (e.g., col., 3), wherein non-combinable requests for media include one or more of requests where a source time of the requested content do not align, requests where project time of the requests do not align (e.g., col., 3), and requests where the requested content is to be processed differently so as to require a separate processing chain (e.g., col., 3); one or more processing units; and a system memory configured to store the software object (e.g., col., 3).

25. Referring to claim 2, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses wherein the software object is a segment filter (e.g., col., 4).

26. Referring to claim 3, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses wherein the software object is exposed to an operating system executing on a computing system implementing the media processing system (e.g., col., 4).

27. Referring to claim 5, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses wherein the software object is implemented within a filter graph representation of a user-defined media processing project, to reduce invoked instances of the media source required to satisfy said non-combinable requests (e.g., col., 4).

28. Referring to claim 6, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses the software object receives independent requests for content from one or more media processing chains (e.g., col., 4).

29. Referring to claim 7, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses wherein the software object generates and issues one or more seek command(s) to satisfy said requests (e.g., col., 4).

30. Referring to claim 8, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses wherein the media processing system selectively invokes multiple instances of the software object to satisfy multiple simultaneous requests for content, wherein each instance of the software object requires an associated instance of the media source anti a processing chain (e.g., col., 4).

31. Referring to claim 9, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses wherein the software object serializes multiple simultaneous requests for media content received from multiple processing chains (e.g., col., 4).

32. Referring to claim 10, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses wherein the software object is a segment filter in a filter graph of filters dynamically generated to process media in accordance with a user-defined processing project (e.g., col., 4).

33. Referring to claim 11, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses a media processing system comprising: a source (e.g., col., 3); a software object, coupling the source to one or more of a plurality of processing chains (e.g., col., 3), to satisfy multiple, non-combinable requests to the source for media content (e.g., col., 3), wherein the software object is a segment filter in a filter graph of filters dynamically generated to process media in accordance with a user-defined processing project (e.g., col., 3); a scalable, dynamically reconfigurable matrix switch having a plurality of inputs and a plurality of outputs (e.g., col., 3); at least one matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a first processing chain portion (e.g., col., 3); at least one other matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a second processing chain portion (e.g., col., 3); the matrix switch being configured to dynamically couple one or more of the matrix switch inputs to one or more of the matrix switch outputs; one or more processing units (e.g., col., 3); and a system memory configured to store the software object (e.g., col., 3).

34. Referring to claim 12, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix switch outputs based, at least in part, on a media time associated with a user defined media processing project (e.g., col., 4).

35. Referring to claim 13, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said

one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix switch outputs based, at least in part, on a project time associated with a user defined media processing project (e.g., col., 4).

36. Referring to claim 14, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix switch outputs based, at least in part, on content of a matrix switch programming grid (e.g., col., 4).

37. Referring to claim 16, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses a media processing system comprising: a source (e.g., col., 3); a software object, coupling the source to one or more of a plurality of processing chains (e.g., col., 3), to satisfy multiple, non-combinable requests to the source for media content (e.g., col., 3), wherein non-combinable requests for media include one or more of requests where a source time of the requested content do not align, requests where project time of the requests do not align (e.g., col., 3), and requests where the requested content is to be processed differently, so as to require a separate processing chain (e.g., col., 3); wherein the software object is a segment filter in a filter graph of filters dynamically generated to process media in accordance with a user-defined processing project one or more processing units (e.g., col., 3); and a system memory configured to store the software object (e.g., col., 3).

38. Referring to claim 17, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses a scalable, dynamically reconfigurable matrix switch having a plurality of inputs and a plurality of outputs; at least one matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a first processing chain portion (e.g., col., 4); at least one other matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a second processing chain portion (e.g., col., 4); and the matrix switch being configured to dynamically couple one or more of the matrix switch inputs to one or more of the matrix switch outputs (e.g., col., 4).

39. Referring to claim 18, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix switch outputs based, at least in part, on a media time associated with the user defined media processing project (e.g., col., 4).

40. Referring to claim 20, Lortz discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lortz also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix switch outputs based, at least in part, on content of a matrix switch programming grid (e.g., col., 4).

41. Claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by DeLeeuw, 6,088,018 (Hereinafter DeLeeuw).

42. Referring to claim 1, DeLeeuw discloses a media processing system comprising: a source (e.g., col., 4); a software object, coupling the source to one or more of a plurality of processing chains, to satisfy multiple (e.g., col., 4), non-combinable requests to the source for media content (e.g., col., 4), wherein non-combinable requests for media include one or more of requests where a source time of the requested content do not align, requests where project time of the requests do not align (e.g., col., 4), and requests where the requested content is to be processed differently so as to require a separate processing chain (e.g., col., 4); one or more processing units; and a system memory configured to store the software object (e.g., col., 4).

43. Referring to claim 2, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses wherein the software object is a segment filter (e.g., col., 5).

44. Referring to claim 3, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses wherein the software object is exposed to an operating system executing on a computing system implementing the media processing system (e.g., col., 5).

45. Referring to claim 5, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses wherein the software object is implemented within a filter graph representation of a user-defined media processing project, to reduce invoked

instances of the media source required to satisfy said non-combinable requests (e.g., col., 5).

46. Referring to claim 6, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses the software object receives independent requests for content from one or more media processing chains (e.g., col., 5).

47. Referring to claim 7, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses wherein the software object generates and issues one or more seek command(s) to satisfy said requests (e.g., col., 5).

48. Referring to claim 8, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses wherein the media processing system selectively invokes multiple instances of the software object to satisfy multiple simultaneous requests for content, wherein each instance of the software object requires an associated instance of the media source anti a processing chain (e.g., col., 5).

49. Referring to claim 9, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses wherein the software object serializes multiple simultaneous requests for media content received from multiple processing chains (e.g., col., 5).

50. Referring to claim 10, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses wherein the software object is a segment filter in a filter graph of filters dynamically generated to process media in accordance with a user-defined processing project (e.g., col., 5).

51. Referring to claim 11, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses a media processing system comprising: a source (e.g., col., 4); a software object, coupling the source to one or more of a plurality of processing chains (e.g., col., 4), to satisfy multiple, non-combinable requests to the source for media content (e.g., col., 4), wherein the software object is a segment filter in a filter graph of filters dynamically generated to process media in accordance with a user-defined processing project (e.g., col., 4); a scalable, dynamically reconfigurable matrix switch having a plurality of inputs and a plurality of outputs (e.g., col., 4); at least one matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a first processing chain portion (e.g., col., 4); at least one other matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a second processing chain portion (e.g., col., 4); the matrix switch being configured to dynamically couple one or more of the matrix switch inputs to one or more of the matrix switch outputs; one or more processing units (e.g., col., 4); and a system memory configured to store the software object (e.g., col., 4).

52. Referring to claim 12, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix switch outputs

based, at least in part, on a media time associated with a user defined media processing project (e.g., col., 5).

53. Referring to claim 13, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix switch outputs based, at least in part, on a project time associated with a user defined media processing project (e.g., col., 5).

54. Referring to claim 14, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix switch outputs based, at least in part, on content of a matrix switch programming grid (e.g., col., 5).

55. Referring to claim 16, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses a media processing system comprising: a source (e.g., col., 4); a software object, coupling the source to one or more of a plurality of processing chains (e.g., col., 4), to satisfy multiple, non-combinable requests to the source for media content (e.g., col., 4), wherein non-combinable requests for media include one or more of requests where a source time of the requested content do not align, requests where project time of the requests do not align (e.g., col., 4), and requests where the requested content is to be processed differently, so as to require a separate processing chain (e.g., col., 4); wherein the software object is a segment filter in a filter graph of filters dynamically

generated to process media in accordance with a user-defined processing project one or more processing units (e.g., col., 4); and a system memory configured to store the software object (e.g., col., 4).

56. Referring to claim 17, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses a scalable, dynamically reconfigurable matrix switch having a plurality of inputs and a plurality of outputs; at least one matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a first processing chain portion (e.g., col., 5); at least one other matrix switch input being communicatively linked with a second processing chain portion (e.g., col., 5); and the matrix switch being configured to dynamically couple one or more of the matrix switch inputs to one or more of the matrix switch outputs (e.g., col., 5).

57. Referring to claim 18, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix switch outputs based, at least in part, on a media time associated with the user defined media processing project (e.g., col., 5).

58. Referring to claim 20, DeLeeuw discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DeLeeuw also discloses wherein the matrix switch is configured to dynamically couple said one or more matrix switch inputs to said one or more matrix switch outputs based, at least in part, on content of a matrix switch programming grid (e.g., col., 5).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

59. Considering the application being old, multiple references are used for the rejections to demonstrate that several references disclose the claimed subject matter of the claims.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Examiner has cited particular columns and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of

the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Haresh N. Patel/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454